



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,266	11/30/2000	Steven L. Pratt	AUS9-2000-0486-USI	5203
35525	7590	10/22/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			LEE, PHILIP C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/726,266	Applicant(s) PRATT ET AL.	
	Examiner Philip C Lee	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,15 and 18-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,15 and 18-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/26/01</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on July 08, 2004.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 15 and 18-28 are presented for examination.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 15, 18-23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira, U.S. Patent 5,809,230 (hereinafter Pereira) in view of Win et al, U.S. Patent 6,161,139 (hereinafter Win).
6. Win was cited in the last office action.

7. As per claims 1, 18 and 27, Pereira taught the invention substantially as claimed for managing resources in a computer network, comprising:

receiving a login identification from a user on a given computer that uses a given operating system, wherein said given operating system requires that attachment of resources to said given computer be performed on said given computer (col. 1, lines 47-54; col. 7, lines 10-37; col. 9, line 34-col. 10, line 33);

matching the user identity with said user configuration file (col. 1, lines 47-54; col. 7, lines 10-37; col. 9, line 34-col. 10, line 33); and

in response to said matching step, executing a resource attachment program on said given computer to attach network resources to said given computer based on the user identity and the contents of said user configuration file (col. 1, lines 47-54; col. 7, lines 10-37; col. 9, line 34-col. 10, line 33).

8. Pereira did not teach defining configuration file for each network user. Win taught a similar system comprising:

defining the contents of a configuration file for each network user (col. 12, lines 45-50; col. 15, lines 30-37).

9. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pereira and Win because Win's system of defining configuration file for each network user would increase the functionality of Pereira's

system by providing resource access control for user accessing a computer over the network (col. 2, lines 35-49).

10. As per claims 2 and 15, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win further taught wherein the contents of the configuration file are defined by a network administrator (col. 12, lines 45-50).

11. As per claim 3, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Win further taught wherein the configuration file is stored on a network server (col. 12, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 43-54; col. 23, lines 20-23).

12. As per claims 5 and 19, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Pereira further taught wherein said resource attachment program is stored on the client computer (col. 7, lines 19-22).

13. As per claims 6 and 20, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win further taught wherein the resource attachment program is stored on a network server (fig. 7; col. 12, lines 51-53).

14. As per claims 7 and 21, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win further taught wherein the step of attaching resources to a client

Art Unit: 2154

further comprises creating a record of all successfully attached resources (col. 13, lines 16-19; col. 23, lines 25-32).

15. As per claims 8 and 22, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win further taught wherein the record is stored on the client (col. 13, lines 20-21; col. 23, lines 47-51).

16. As per claims 9 and 23, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win further taught wherein the record is stored on a network server (col. 13, lines 21-23).

17. Claims 10-11, 24-25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira and Win in view of Hudson et al, U.S. Patent 6,055,637 (hereinafter Hudson).

18. Hudson was cited in the last office action.

19. As per claims 10, 24 and 28, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 18 and 27 above. Pereira and Win did not teach unattaching the resources when the user log out. Hudson taught comprising:

receiving a log out command from the user and unattaching the attached resources (col. 1, lines 67-col. 2, lines 2; col. 5, lines 64-col. 6, lines 4).

20. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pereira, Win and Hudson because Hudson's teaching of unattaching the resources would increase the efficiency of Pereira's and Win's systems by allowing the unattached resources to be allocating to another user.

21. As per claims 11 and 25, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Pereira and Win did not teach deleting the record of attached resources when a user log out. Hudson taught comprising:

receiving a log out command from the user and deleting the record of attached resources (col. 5, lines 64-col. 6, lines 4).

22. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pereira, Win and Hudson because Hudson's teaching of deleting the record of attached resources would increase the security of Pereira's and Win's systems by preventing another user from accessing the record of attached resources.

23. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira, Win in view of Bauer et al, U.S. Patent 5,819,047 (hereinafter Bauer).

24. Bauer was cited in the last office action.

Art Unit: 2154

25. As per claims 12 and 26, Pereira and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Pereira and Win did not teach the client computer uses the UNIX operating system. Bauer taught wherein the client computer uses the UNIX operating system (col. 1, lines 31-40; col. 3, lines 31-48).

26. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pereira, Win and Bauer because Bauer's teaching of using the UNIX operating system would enhance Pereira's and Win's systems by increasing the field of use in their systems.


27. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-12, 15 and 18-28, filed 07/08/04, have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive and are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

28. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX**

Art Unit: 2154

MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Lee whose telephone number is (703) 305-7721. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Philip Lee



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100